

S/N: 10/ 657,293
Docket : TIC03-001
Reply to the Office action dated 09/09/2005

Page 9

file: tic03-001-roa3-d2-dated 2005-09-09.doc

Remarks/Arguments

Examiner Legesse is thanked for the thorough Office Action.

IN THE CLAIMS

The claims are amended. No new matter is added.

Applicant amended parent claim 1 to include the subject matter of objected to claim 10. Therefore parent claim 1 and all dependent claims from parent claim 1 should be allowable.

Parent Claim 32 is amended to add the limitation of: “said light apparatus does not project light between said alignment segment and said aiming spot: said light apparatus and said base are not attached to a golf club or a golfer;“ . For support see amended claim 1. (objected to dep claim 10.

No new matter is added.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 USC § 102

Rejection of claims 1-5, 8, 25 and 32 under 102b as being anticipated by Bennett

The rejection of claims 1-5, 8 25 and 32 under 102b as being anticipated by Bennett is acknowledged. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested in view of the amendments.

Applicant amended parent claim 1 to include the subject matter of objected to claim 10. Therefore parent claim 1 and all dependent claims from parent claim 1 including claims 2-5, 8, 25 are allowable.

Applicant does not agree that the reasons for rejecting the claims. Applicants non-response to the rejections does not signify any agreement or disclaimer.

S/N: 10/ 657,293
Docket : TIC03-001
Reply to the Office action dated 09/09/2005

Page 10

file: tic03-001-roa3-d2-dated 2005-09-09.doc

Amended Claim 32 is non-obvious

Amended claim 32 states:

32 . (CURRENTLY AMENDED) A golf putt training device comprising:
a light apparatus,
a base for supporting said light apparatus,
said base having alignment support means that enables said light apparatus to simultaneously project an alignment segment on a playing surface, and to project an aiming spot on said playing surface with said alignment segment being projected over said ball and a putter head, said alignment segment is comprised of at least one line segment; said base is not attached to putter club of the putter head;
said light apparatus does not project light between said alignment segment and said aiming spot;
said light apparatus and said base are not attached to a golf club or a golfer;
whereby said alignment segment is used to align said putter head during a swing.

Claim 32 is non-obvious over Bennett because does not suggest the following limitation “said base having alignment support means that enables said light apparatus to simultaneously project an alignment segment on a playing surface and to project an aiming spot on said playing surface ...”. In contrast Bennett teaches away by shining only light at a time. See Bennet figures 1 and 2. Figure 2 shows the laser transmitter 34 that shines a single laser beam 36. See figure col..3, L 64 to col. 5, L 4.

Moreover, the Office action on page 2 posits that the alignment segment is shown by element 20 in figure 1. However, col. 4, lines 65 to col. 5, L 2. states that 20 is merely a transverse grid line (were measurement can be made from) not a projected alignment segment (as in applicant's claim 1). Furthermore, as discussed above, Bennett's laser is not capable of projecting applicant's claim 1 alignment segment because Bennett's laser only projects a point of light. There is no motivation to change Bennett's laser because Bennett's laser /surveying method requires a laser point to make measurements.

Rejection of claims 1-25, 26 and 32 under 102b as being anticipated by Malard et al.

Rejection of claims 1-25, 26 and 32 under 102b as being anticipated by Malard et al. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested in view of the amendments.

S/N: 10/ 657,293
Docket : TIC03-001
Reply to the Office action dated 09/09/2005

Page 11
file: tuc03-001-roa3-d2-dated 2005-09-09.doc

Applicant amended parent claim 1 to include the subject matter of objected to claim 10. Therefore parent claim 1 and all dependent claims from parent claim 1 including claims 25 and 26 are allowable.

Applicant does not agree with the reasons for rejecting the previously presented claims. Applicant's rewriting of objected to claims, and non-response to the rejections does not signify any agreement or disclaimer.

Claims 25 and 26 depend from allowable amended claim 1.

Amended Claim 32 is non-obvious over Malard et al.

Amended claim 32 states:

32 . (CURRENTLY AMENDED) A golf putt training device comprising:
a light apparatus,
a base for supporting said light apparatus,
said base having alignment support means that enables said light apparatus to simultaneously project an alignment segment on a playing surface, and to project an aiming spot on said playing surface with said alignment segment being projected over said ball and a putter head, said alignment segment is comprised of at least one line segment; said base is not attached to putter club of the putter head;
said light apparatus does not project light between said alignment segment and said aiming spot;
said light apparatus and said base are not attached to a golf club or a golfer; whereby said alignment segment is used to align said putter head during a swing.

Mallard teaches a line generating device using a laser diode and lens to project a fan shaped beams of visible light. See Abstract L1-2. see figures 1, and 9A.

Mallard does not suggest as least the claim 32 limitation "said light apparatus does not project light between said alignment segment and said aiming spot: ". There is no motivation to modify Mallard because Mallard is designed to solve the problem of generating a line/fan of light. See title.

Claim 32 is thought to be non-obvious over the prior art for additional reasons not discussed.

S/N: 10/ 657,293
Docket : TIC03-001
Reply to the Office action dated 09/09/2005

Page 12
file: lic03-001-roa3-d2-dated 2005-09-09.doc

Allowable subject matter

The allowance of claims 11-13 and 27-31 are gratefully acknowledged.

The objection to claims 6, 7 9, and 10 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim 1, but allowable if rewritten in independent form is acknowledged. Objected to claim 10 is incorporated into parent claim 1. Amended parent claim 1 should be allowable.

By amending claim 1 to incorporate the objected to claim 10, applicant is not conceding that the previously presented (last office action) claim 1 and/or the any other dependent claims are not patentable. In contrast, Applicant posits the claims as presented in previous response to office action are patentable.

Applicant does not agree that the reasons for rejecting the claims. Applicants non-response to the rejections does not signify any agreement or disclaimer.

Addressing all pending claims

It is believed that all the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not bee expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper. and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of the unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

S/N: 10/ 657,293
Docket : TIC03-001
Reply to the Office action dated 09/09/2005

Page 13
file: tic03-001-roa3-d2-dated 2005-09-09.doc

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested. Allowance of all claims is requested. Issuance of the application is requested.

It is requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned attorney at (215) 670-2455 should there be anyway that we could help to place this Application in condition for Allowance.

Charge to Deposit Account

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to apply any fees or credits in this case, which are not already covered by check or credit card, to Deposit Account No. 502018 referencing this attorney docket. The Commissioner is also authorized to charge any additional fee under 37 CFR §1.16 and 1.17 to this Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 4, 2005

/William J. Stoffel/

William J. Stoffel Reg. No. 39,390
215-670-2455
Customer number 30402

Stoffel Law Office
1735 Market St - Ste A455
Philadelphia, PA 19103-7502 USA
Telephone: 215-670-2455
Fax: 267-200-0730

file name: tic03-001-roa2-d4-filed- dated 2005-04-25.doc

===== End of fax =====